PRC

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/518,015	03/03/2000	Elliot A. Gottfurcht	004346.P001X	5511

7590 06/04/2003

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
Seventh floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER
JOSEPH, THOMAS J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	12

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/518,015	GOTTFURCHT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas J Joseph	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 March 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-48* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *11-22* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 23-48* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *11* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 6, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolan et al (US 5,801,702) and Arora et al (US 5,911,145).

Claims 1 and 6:

Dolan teaches a software program (abstract). All software programs require a computer readable storage medium containing executable computer program instructions. Such computer instructions operate on a digital processor. Dolan teaches providing links for accessing a sister site that permits simplified navigation (fig. 8c; col. 18, lines 18 – 35). Any page accessible throughout the tree of the hierarchy is a sister page. Further, the creating of links for accessing sites creates a type of access to an associated web page. This is a type of sister site. Dolan teaches serving pages from the sister site responsive to actuation of the link on the web page (fig. 8c; col. 18, lines 18 – 35). When any sister page is selected, web pages are opened. These web pages are serving pages responsive to the actuation of the link. Dolan fails to teach a specific web page for providing links to sister sites or any other site. Dolan does suggest the need for providing a specific link to a sister site by providing a list of potential sites.

Further, pages higher up in the hierarchy do suggest the potential for storing multiple pages within a site.

Arora teaches a web site containing links to various sister sites along with potential outside sites (fig. 4, #470, #472). Arora teaches providing a link to a sister site (fig. 43; col. 14, lines 35 – 40). Arora mentions linking to a next sibling or a previous linking. This demonstrates accessing various sister sites. Furthermore, adding links provides a simplified navigation interface for the web page by the sister site.
It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the web site containing links taught by Arora with the sister sites responsive to the actuation of links disclosed by Dolan. Doing so allows the user including the user not familiar with computer terminology to navigate to different links within the web site in a timesaving fashion.

Claim 25:

Dolan and Arora teach the rationale for accessing a sister site using the Internet in rejected claim 1.

3. Claims 2, 7, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolan and Arora as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Schein et al. (US 6,388,714).

Claims 2 and 7:

Dolan fails to teach a method for entering alphanumeric indications associated with the navigation option. Arora teaches a method where a user can enter alphanumeric indications, in the form of a character string, associated with a URL (fig.

43). The URL is a type of navigation option. The naming of a node using the properties of a window is a method wherein the processor accepts an alphanumeric indication of a navigation option. Arora teaches a matrix that corresponds with a navigation option (fig. 40; col. 14, lines 5 – 23). The various cells within the matrix are used for displaying a portion of the corresponding web page. Links to accessing a full screen version of the said web page can be provided. This is a method where a matrix is equipped with a navigation option. Links for accessing associated sites or sister sites creates a simplified navigation. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine entering alphanumeric indicators taught by Arora with the sister sites responsive to the actuation of links Dolan. Doing so allows the user including the user not familiar with computer terminology to personally customize names for potential links.

While Dolan and Arora teach various type of navigation GUIs using the web, Dolan and Arora fail to teach a simplified navigation interface employing a multi-layered matrix. Schein teaches a simplified navigation interface that employs a multi-layered matrix (fig. 14c – 14d). This GUI also demonstrates the navigation option displayed by the navigation interface. Further, Schein demonstrates the display of alphanumeric text to describe various navigation options (fig. 14c – 14d). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the simplified navigation interface employing a multi-layered matrix taught by Schein with the web page navigation disclosed by Dolan and Arora. Doing so allows the user to navigate

various audio/visual programming options offered using a user-friendly method that requires a minimum amount of additional instruction.

Claims 43 and 44:

While Dolan and Arora teach various type of navigation GUIs using the web, Dolan and Arora fail to teach a simplified navigation interface that includes an email form. Schein teaches a simplified navigation interface that includes an email form (fig. 15c). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the simplified navigation interface that includes an email form taught by Schein with the web page navigation disclosed by Dolan and Arora. Doing so allows the user to access personal messages using a user-friendly method that requires a minimum amount of additional instruction.

4. Claims 3 – 5 and 8 – 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolan and Arora as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Charles Heinemann, "Going from HTML to XML", Microsoft Corporation and Call (US 6,418,441).

Claims 3 and 8:

Dolan and Arora fail to disclose transcoding, formatting, or cascading XML, DTD, HTML, etc. Heinemann teaches converting HTML pages to XML (p. 2). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the processing and transcoding of markup language suggested or taught by Heinemann with the method for making sister sites responsive to the actuation of links disclosed by

Dolan and Arora. Doing so allows the user to transcode various markup languages including HTML into a universal form that is more universal such as XML.

Dolan, Arora, and Heineman fail to teach applying a DTD to XML. Call teaches applying a DTD to XML (col. 25; lines 10 – 20). Call further teaches that XML provides metadata capabilities that divide information into a hierarchical structure (col. 25, lines 10 – 20). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the applying a DTD to XML taught by Call with the method for making sister sites responsive to the actuation of links disclosed by Dolan, Arora, and Heineman. Doing so provides a standard method for facilitating the definition and validation of data structures.

Claims 4 and 9:

Call teaches formatting the XML into XSL (col. 24; lines 10 – 30). Call teaches transforming the formatted page into one of extensible HTML and HTML (col. 24; lines 10 – 30).

Claims 5 and 10:

Call teaches applying a cascading style sheet (CSS) to the XML page (col. 24; lines 10 – 30).

5. Claims 23, 24, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolan and Arora as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Croy et al. (US 6,476,875).

Claims 23 and 26:

Dolan teaches software (abstract). All software requires a computer readable medium. Dolan and Arora fail to teach displaying the navigation interface on a television set, the television set having a remote control. Croy teaches displaying the navigation interface on a television set, the television set having a remote control (fig. 1, #100). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine displaying the navigation interface on a television set, the television set having a remote control taught by Croy with the web page navigation disclosed by Dolan and Arora. Doing so allows the ordinary user to make selections without actually making a physical adjustment using controls physically connected to the television itself.

Claims 24 and 27:

Dolan teaches software (abstract). All software requires a computer readable medium. Dolan and Arora fail to teach displaying the simplified navigation interface on a portable wireless device. Croy teaches displaying the simplified navigation interface on a portable wireless device (fig. 3b – 3c). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the displaying the simplified navigation interface on a portable wireless device taught by Croy with the web page navigation disclosed by Dolan and Arora. Doing so enables the user to make selections from remote locations.

6. Claims 28 – 38, 40 – 42, 47, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolan and Arora as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Donnelly (US 6,460,181).

Claim 28:

While Dolan and Arora suggest sister sites that are servers on a network by teaching sister sites, Dolan and Arora fail to teach sister sites that are also network servers. Donnelly teaches a sister site being a server on a network (col. 9, lines 58 – 67). Web sites typically originate at servers on a network. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the sister site corresponding to a server on a network taught by Donnelly with the web page navigation disclosed by Dolan and Arora. Doing so allows the ordinary user to make appropriate selections almost instantaneously using a minimum number of keystrokes or mouse clicks.

Claims 29 and 30:

Dolan and Arora fail to teach a web page containing commercial content. Donnelly teaches a web page containing commercial content (col. 4, lines 50 - 63). Advertising links provide commercial content. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the displaying the web page containing commercial content taught by Donnelly with the web page navigation disclosed by Dolan and Arora. Doing so allows advertisers to make announcements on user viewable web pages.

Claims 31 and 32:

Dolan and Arora fail to teach displaying the navigation interface via a computer system. Donnelly teaches displaying the navigation interface via a computer system (col. 9, lines 58 – 67). The GUI provides a computerized navigation interface. It would

have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine displaying the navigation interface via a computer system taught by Donnelly with the web page sister sites disclosed by Dolan and Arora. Doing so allows users to access larger web sites.

Claims 33 and 34:

Donnelly teaches providing a second web page associated with the sister site (col. 4, lines 57 - 63). Donnelly teaches providing the simplified navigation interface for the second web page by the sister site (col. 4, lines 57 - 63). The EPG provides a simplified navigation database for accessing web pages by the sister site. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the providing a second web page associated with the sister site taught by Donnelly with the web page navigation disclosed by Dolan and Arora. Doing so allows the ordinary user enables the user to quickly and simply access various web pages within the web site.

Claims 35 and 36:

Dolan and Arora fail to teach a simplified navigation option that includes primary navigation options. Donnelly teaches the simplified navigation option that includes primary navigation options (col. 4, lines 57 - 63). Buttons and icons for accessing various screens and programs are considered primary navigation options. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine a simplified navigation option that includes primary navigation options taught by Donnelly with the web page navigation disclosed by Dolan and Arora. Doing so

allows the ordinary user to make important selections with a minimum number of keystrokes or mouse clicks.

Claims 37 and 38:

Dolan and Arora fail to teach a web page that is publicly accessible. Donnelly teaches a web page that is publicly accessible (col. 4, lines 50 - 63). Advertising links often lead to publicly accessible web pages. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine a web page that is publicly accessible taught by Donnelly with the web page navigation disclosed by Dolan and Arora. Doing so enables the ordinary user to access web pages from any Internet terminal.

Claim 40:

Dolan and Arora fail to teach displaying purchasing information related to at least one item via the matrix layer. Donnelly teaches displaying purchasing information related to at least one item via the matrix layer (col. 9, lines 58 – 67). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine displaying purchasing information related to at least one item via the matrix layer taught by Donnelly with the web page navigation disclosed by Dolan and Arora. Doing so allows the ordinary user to use the grid-like GUI for purchasing products and services.

Claims 41 and 42:

Dolan and Arora fail to teach a simplified navigation interface that includes a search form. Donnelly teaches simplified navigation interfaces that include a search form (col. 7, lines 10 – 40). This demonstrates a method for searching available

programs by category or time. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the simplified navigation interfaces that include a search form taught by Donnelly with the web page navigation disclosed by Dolan and Arora. Doing so allows the ordinary user to search for categorized items using a time saving method.

Claims 47 and 48:

Dolan and Arora fail to teach a simplified navigation interface that includes a multi-layer matrix wherein each matrix layer including multiple cells. Donnelly teaches a simplified navigation interface that includes a multi-layer matrix wherein each matrix layer including multiple cells (fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the simplified navigation interface that includes a multi-layer matrix wherein each matrix layer including multiple cells taught by Donnelly with the web page navigation disclosed by Dolan and Arora. Doing so allows the ordinary user to view various options using a grid-like table format.

7. Claims 39, 45, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolan, Arora, and Schein et al. (US 6,388,714) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Donnelly (US 6,460,181).

Claim 39:

Dolan and Arora fail to teach displaying purchasing information related to at least one item via the matrix layer. Donnelly teaches displaying purchasing information related to at least one item via the matrix layer (col. 9, lines 58 – 67). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine

displaying purchasing information related to at least one item via the matrix layer taught by Donnelly with the web page navigation disclosed by Dolan and Arora. Doing so allows the ordinary user to use the grid-like GUI for purchasing products and services.

Claims 45 and 46:

Dolan and Arora fail to teach displaying a purchasing interface in response to receiving a navigation option input. Donnelly teaches displaying a purchasing interface in response to receiving a navigation option input (col. 9, lines 58 – 67). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine displaying a purchasing interface in response to receiving a navigation option input by Donnelly with the web page navigation disclosed by Dolan and Arora. Doing so enables the user to place on-line purchases.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 3-24-2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Examiner objected to the drawings in the previous office action. The Applicant responds by providing a new set of formal drawings that overcomes the said objection. The Examiner therefore withdraws the said objection.

The Applicant acknowledges the restriction of the previous office action by stating that claims 1 – 10 are elected without traverse.

The Applicant responds to the 35 USC 103 rejections of claims 1, 2, 6, and 7. The Applicant asserts that Dolan does not teach a web page that provides links to a sister site. The Examiner responds by stating that pages within the hierarchy,

particularly those that access a set of sub-pages, demonstrate a web site. The website editor demonstrated by Arora teaches the concepts for providing a sibling URL. A URL teaches accessing a link to a different web site or web page within a said website while a link to a sibling URL teaches accessing a sister web site. The Applicant asserts that motivation does not exist for combining Dolan and Arora because the first is a network client while the second is a web page editor. The Examiner responds by stating that both Dolan and Arora provide motivation because both teach the basic concepts for constructing pages for use on with the World Wide Web.

In regards to claims 2 and 7, the Applicant asserts that Arora fails to teach accepting alphanumeric input corresponding with a navigation option. The Applicant also asserts that Arora fails to teach the navigation option associated with the matrix disclosed by the Applicant. The Examiner responds by stating that Arora teaches a method where a user can enter alphanumeric indications, in the form of a character string, associated with a URL (fig. 43). The URL is a type of navigation option. The naming of a node using the properties of a window is a method wherein the processor accepts an alphanumeric indication of a navigation option. Arora teaches a matrix that corresponds with a navigation option (fig. 40; col. 14, lines 5 – 23). The various cells within the matrix are used for displaying a portion of the corresponding web page. Providing links or buttons for accessing full screen versions of the said web pages displayed on the matrix is a method for navigation. This is how a matrix can be equipped with a navigation option.

Due to at least the above reasons, the 35 USC 103 rejections of claims 1 – 2, 6, and 7 remains standing.

The Applicant responds to the rejection of claims 3 – 5 and 8 – 10. However, the response is now moot due to new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J Joseph whose telephone number is 703-305-3917. The examiner can normally be reached Mondays through Fridays from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

tjj
May 30, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100